

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interest of the Working People

Vol. 29 - No. 28

Monday, July 26, 1965

Price 10c

Fidel Castro's Speech On the Algerian Coup

— See Page 4 —

U.S. COMMITS FORCE TO VIETNAM ON THE SCALE OF A KOREAN WAR

By Dick Roberts

NEW YORK, July 20 — As we go to press, the escalation of American troop commitment to Vietnam on a scale approaching that of the Korean War is all but an accomplished fact. Before flying to Saigon, July 14, Defense Secretary McNamara made it clear that there would be an increased build-up of combat troops in Vietnam, a mobilization of the National Guard and an expansion of the draft.

The exact figures that Washington's warmakers have in mind, of course, cannot be guessed. Hanson W. Baldwin, the *New York Times* military specialist, put as definite, July 11, that 100,000 to 125,000 combat ground forces would be in Vietnam in the near future, just counting those already there and those "on their way or already scheduled to transfer."

Four days later, the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for 179,000 troops for Vietnam by the end of the year, and recommended activating 240,000 National Guardsmen. This massive troop commitment comes at a time when there is every indication that the Saigon government forces — who have done the brunt of the fighting in South Vietnam — are suffering heavy setbacks, threatening an imminent collapse of the U.S.-puppet regime.

Wall Street Journal staff reporter Philip Geyelin spelled out the extent of these losses July 15: "The hard fact is," he wrote, "that while the U.S. is building up strength, the Vietcong are rapidly gobbling up huge chunks of South Vietnam. In short, they're winning the war."

"Hamlets and villages by the score are being overrun; strategic district towns are beginning to



Johnson

topple; the pressure is mounting on key provincial capitals . . ."

A breakdown of the Saigon government effort could come from a number of factors, Geyelin reports: "A stunning military reverse; a switch to the other side by a disheartened, or perhaps opportunistic major South Vietnamese army unit; runaway infla-

tion or an acute food shortage; a political coup predicated on peace at almost any price."

These facts were undoubtedly well known to Washington when President Johnson first hinted at the new troop increases and stated "new and serious decisions will be necessary in the near future." Johnson clearly has no intentions of letting the Saigon regime collapse in his face, and since this requires throwing more American soldiers into combat, this appears to be exactly what Johnson intends to do.

Ominous Warning

Senator Wayne Morse, whose position on the Foreign Relations Committee allows him to sit in on high level war preparation briefings, delivered an ominous warning about Washington's plans on the Senate floor July 16. Pointing out that the Saigon forces number between 500,000 and 750,000 while those of the National Liberation Front are in the neighborhood of 50,000 to 75,000, Morse stated:

"The interesting thing is that the Vietcong control about 75 per cent of the land area of Vietnam. What the American people are not being told is that they control the local governments, they collect the taxes, they appoint the teachers. . . This administration will not give

us the facts about what goes on in the Vietcong controlled areas of South Vietnam."

Then Morse stated that there was no mere coincidence in the fact that the U.S. is simultaneously intensifying the air raids on North Vietnam as it increases the ground forces in South Vietnam: "When we have landed a sufficient land army in Vietnam and prepared adequate coastal bases to supply it," he warned, "the air raids will find their way to areas in or around China that will bring China into war."

"Whatever the views of the President in this respect," Morse charged, "I am satisfied that the chance to bomb China is the objective of a large body of opinion in the Pentagon and unfortunately the Department of State." Challenging the Pentagon to issue a statement denying this charge, the Senator continued, "When we are adequately prepared on the ground, we will be ready to start whatever provocative bombing around [China's] borders may be necessary." (*Congressional Record*, pp. 16523 f.)

This warning cannot be easily discredited. The escalation of the war in Vietnam towards a major air and ground war, possibly including China, has been developing with horrifying precision. However, the vast majority of the American people have no way of

knowing what plans Washington has worked out for the war.

The new stage in the escalation of the Vietnam war, the decision by Washington to greatly increase U.S. combat forces, makes clear the necessity of building an active and united movement against this dirty war. As Johnson drags the nation ever deeper into war, it becomes more and more important to raise the demand, as loud as possible, through demonstration, teach-in, independent political action, and in other ways, "Get the U.S. troops out of Vietnam now!"

War with China?

"I have said for many months that I am satisfied, as a member of the foreign relations committee of the U.S. Senate, that we have a dangerous, desperate group of men in the Pentagon who want a preventive war against China and who would like to create an opportunity to bomb the Chinese nuclear installations. I consider them the most desperate and dangerous men in the world." Senator Wayne Morse, *Congressional Record*, p. 16527, July 16.

WHILE RACIST ATTACKS CONTINUE

Louisiana Police Harass Deacons

By Fred Halstead

JULY 20 — The Deacons of Defense and Justice in Bogalusa, La., a Negro self-defense organization, are facing increasing harassment, arrests, and moves by state police to disarm them while the civil rights workers they have sworn to protect continue to suffer physical attacks from whites under the very noses of local and state cops.

That local police have allowed racist violence against peaceful civil rights demonstrators was attested to even by John Doar, head of the U.S. Justice Department's civil rights division. He filed petitions in Bogalusa July 19 seeking contempt citations against the Bogalusa police for failing to protect demonstrators against assaults by racists. Doar witnessed the beating of civil rights pickets July 16 by white hecklers outside a shopping center while police stood by.

Earlier, 19-year-old CORE worker John Hamilton explained the situation facing civil rights workers in Bogalusa: "I demonstrated three times and I got beaten three times. The state troopers here may keep you from getting killed — if you're lucky. But they do not get involved when it's just a little honest head whipping."

On July 19, Joe Gatlin, 26, a Bogalusa Negro resident, was booked by police on charges of

"attempted murder." Police, who claim he is a member of the Deacons, say he fired shots at a carload of white nightriders near Bogalusa. There were no injuries. It is not illegal in Louisiana to carry guns in autos, and Klansmen in the area do so as a matter of course. The first Negro policeman in Bogalusa was killed by white nightriders earlier this year.

Yet, Governor John J. McKeithen has announced that state troopers will disarm Negroes in cars and confiscate their guns "until the Supreme Court orders us to give them back."

Night Rallies

Nightly rallies of white racists were held in a lot outside Bogalusa earlier this month. Among the speakers was Rev. Connie Lynch, a right-wing preacher from Riverside, Calif., who told a crowd of 1,500 July 8: "If it takes killing to get them niggers off our streets and to protect our constitutional rights, then I say let's kill 'em."

Lynch made similar statements at a rally of the rabidly anti-Negro National States Rights Party at the Calhoun County courthouse in Anniston, Ala., July 15. Two hours later, a 38-year-old Negro factory worker was fatally shot by nightriders just outside Anniston. The Negro, Willie Brewster, father of two, was driving home from work when he was fired on from

a car full of whites. Brewster died July 18.

In Bogalusa, the Deacons of Defense and Justice had determined to defend their community against thugs being fired up by Lynch and other such racist organizers. On July 8, while Lynch was still in Bogalusa, a peaceful march was held by some 400 civil rights demonstrators. A Negro girl was hit by a missile thrown by white hecklers, as police stood by, and



CHURCH BOMBINGS, murder and other forms of racist terror point up need for Negro self defense in the South.

she and a white nurse entered a car following the march. In the car were two young men said to be Deacons, Henry Austin, 21, and Milton Johnson, 26.

According to witnesses, a white man, Alton D. Crowe, 25, was shot after he followed the injured girl to the car and began punching the occupants in the face. The police promptly arrested Austin and Johnson and held them, apparently without bail, on charges of shooting Crowe. Crowe, the attacker, was not arrested. He is recovering in a hospital.

GREENSBORO, Ala., July 18 — Two Negro churches were burned to the ground here today. The Rev. A. T. Days, pastor of the St. Matthews AME Church and a civil rights leader, said the burned structures were the St. Mark AME Church in Greensboro and the Elmwood AME Zion Church north of town.

Two days before, over 100 Negro demonstrators picketed downtown white merchants in an effort to win voter registration, education and job opportunities. They were counter-picketed by local Klan members. When the demonstrators returned to their headquarters, the St. Matthews Church, they were surrounded by whites in cars and trucks, and attacked with bottles (Continued on Page 2)

General Ky Says: Hitler Is My Hero

(World Outlook) — General Nguyen Cao Ky, Washington's newest puppet dictator in Saigon, said in an interview with Brian Moynahan in the July 4 London Sunday Mirror, "People ask me who my heroes are. I have only one — Hitler."

"I admire Hitler," explained Ky, "because he pulled his country together when it was in a terrible state in the early Thirties. But the situation here is so desperate now that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam."

A few days later, Ky said he hadn't meant to praise Hitler: "When I referred to Hitler . . . I had in mind the idea that Vietnam needed above all leadership and a sense of discipline in order to face the criminal aggression of Communism."

THE NATIONAL PICKET LINE

William H. Lavins, a retired coal miner, was killed while marching on a pensioners' picket line in Uniontown, Pa., on June 26. At the time of his death, Lavins was president of Local union 4731, United Mine Workers of America, at Crutcher, Pa.

He was killed when a driver for the S & A Coal Company, which was being picketed, stopped his truck 75 feet away from the pickets. He walked over to the pensioners and said he would run over them and push their bodies into a creek across the highway if they didn't move. According to witnesses, the driver, identified as Lawrence Soberdash, son of the mine owner, got back into his truck, "revved" it up, and roared through the picket line, killing Mr. Lavins. Thousands of coal miners from surrounding areas attended Lavins' funeral.

At last reports, the cops still hadn't caught Soberdash.

The top 28 steel companies in the U.S., which produce nearly 94 percent of the country's steel, reported record profits in 1964. The July Steel Labor reported that profits after taxes reached

\$954.8 million, an increase of 27.4 percent over the previous year.

Steel Labor also reported that "since 1961 output per man-hour for all employees has risen by an amazing 4.9 percent per year." Most of this is attributed to advanced methods of production. In the last two years, for example, more than a dozen steel plants have replaced obsolete open hearths by installing new basic oxygen converters and new electric burners.

"It is felt," continued Steel Labor, "that once much of the construction of the new plant and equipment is completed the rate of productivity will continue increasing and . . . employment will again decline."

An armed posse of volunteer deputy sheriffs recently charged and broke up a picket line manned by members of Local 677 of the Chemical Workers union in West Haverstraw, N. Y. According to Rockland County Sheriff J. Henry Mock, the volunteer mounted patrol which he formed three years ago was used against the pickets at the request of officials of the strikebound Kay-Fries Chemicals Co.

The reason given for the mounted assault was purportedly to let supervisory personnel enter the plant. A local weekly newspaper, however, more correctly compared the antiunion attack to the mounted deputies riding down a freedom demonstration in Alabama.

Widespread reports recently circulated by the Association of American Railroads claim that safety conditions were greatly improved despite the layoff of 15,000 firemen in the past year.

Government accident statistics, however, don't bear up the Association's claims, according to the July TWU Express. It reported: 1) a 15.6 percent increase in the number of train accidents; 2) a 14.4 percent increase in the number of train accidents resulting in casualties; 3) a 15.5 percent increase in the number of employees killed; 4) a 5.5 percent increase in the number of employees killed or injured. Despite this rapid deterioration of safety conditions, the Express observed that the railroads "intend to remove a lot more [firemen] in the next year."

—Tom Leonard

SWP Candidate To Speak in N.Y. At Antiwar Rally

NEW YORK — On Saturday, July 31, at 3 p.m., the Tompkins Square Neighbors for Peace Action will hold a rally on Third St., between Avenues B and C. Speakers will include Hedda Garza, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Comptroller; Mark Lane, former New York state assemblyman; Conrad Lynn, civil rights attorney; and Felipe De Jesus of the Progressive Labor Party. Other organizations invited to provide speakers are Students for a Democratic Society, Women Strike for Peace, and Movement for Puerto Rican Independence.

The Tompkins Square Neighbors for Peace Action is attempting to mobilize the community in New York's Lower East Side against the unjust, expensive war in Vietnam, and to demand that military expenditures be diverted toward constructive measures to alleviate poverty and slum conditions. For more information, contact Tompkins Square Neighbors for Peace Action, 6 Avenue B, Apt. 5A.

A Contribution to the Discussion

I. F. Stone Views the Peace Movement

By Fred Halstead

The June 28 issue of I.F. Stone's Weekly contains a contribution to the discussion now going on in the antiwar movement entitled: "What Should the Peace Movement Do?" It is one of a number of such articles now appearing in various publications*, and it deserves comment.

Stone divides the growing antiwar movement "roughly" into three groups. He calls one the "democratic forces," which he describes as those who want to "persuade, to win public support for an end to the war in Vietnam and to intervention in the Dominican Republic." He calls the second the "religious forces," which he characterizes as those mainly interested in "testifying" to their moral disapproval of the war by "disobeying the law."

The third he calls the "revolutionary forces," who he says want to express solidarity with the "Viet Cong" and the Dominican "rebels" by "obstructing" the war effort and who "in the context of present political realities, can fulfill little more than the role of agents provocateurs, giving the government an excuse for repression."

Cold War Formula

One thing obviously wrong with this way of stating things is the implication that the bulk of those in the "religious" or "revolutionary" forces are not democratic. On the basis of Stone's record, we trust he didn't mean it that way, but it is just the kind of formula the cold war warriors like to use to their own purpose.

Stone's description of the "revolutionary forces" as a "curious mélange of Maoism and Stalinism with Negro nationalism" is really not up to his usual high standards of journalistic accuracy. If such a strange mélange does exist, it accounts for only a tiny part of the antiwar movement.

Those whose sympathies lie with the Vietnamese guerrillas and the Dominican constitutionalists as against the authors of U.S. imperialist policy, and who view revolutionary change in the U.S. as desirable and necessary, are the great majority of the younger activists in the movement.

These revolutionary forces include a variety of ideological tendencies and a lot of people from no particular tendency at all. They are by far the most dynamic, successful and least sectarian section of the movement and have been responsible for dragging the other

sections along.

As for "agents provocateurs," they are the products of the police agencies, and any movement incurring the wrath of such agencies should beware of wild schemes. But Stone's use of the term in connection with any ideological tendency in the movement is wrong and reckless to say the least. Such accusations have in the past been used as a witch-hunt device to stop discussion and exclude ideological tendencies with which the accusers disagree. The only excluding that should be done is the exclusion of this brutal and dangerous method of arguing. Once again, judging from Stone's excellent civil liberties record, we trust he didn't mean it that way, but it is a regrettable formulation all the same.

A central point in Stone's piece seems to be a concern that the new movement not be sidetracked into irrelevance through suicidal adventures or isolated acts of civil disobedience. This is a constructive concern in the sense that the movement must aim at becoming a mass movement in order to develop significant power against the war. Civil disobedience can be an effective tactic by a mass movement, but isolated or premature actions can lead to dissipation of energies, unnecessary victimization and disillusionment. The activists in the movement should avoid the illusion that the moral outrage of a handful can substitute for mass action.

Stone puts great stress on the need for educational activity, on the opportunity of the movement to widen the debate, begun by the teach-ins, on Vietnam and the cold war. This is important, since the

myths of the cold war, including red-baiting hysteria, justify treating people called "communist" as anti-human, napalm bombing them, invading them, and so on.

When certain tendencies—which Stone would presumably put among the "democratic forces"—insist on excluding leftists from the movement, or refuse to participate in common actions around points of common agreement, they are not educating for what Stone calls "reconciliation." They are going along with the cold war hysteria. Indeed, if these tendencies really want to express "democratic" norms and help re-educate the American people to overcome the hysterical anti-red atmosphere which excuses Vietnams, they should take every opportunity to make a demonstration of working together with leftists on points of common agreement—including the Communist Party specifically since it is still a chief whipping boy of the cold warriors.

* These include: Dave Dellinger, "March on Washington and Its Critics," (May Liberation); Robert Pickus, "Political Integrity and Its Critics," (June-July Liberation); Bayard Rustin, "From Protest to Politics," (Feb. Commentary); Staughton Lynd, "Coalition Politics or Non-Violent Revolution," (answer to Rustin in June-July Liberation); Jack Smith, two articles on the peace movement (June 19 and 26 National Guardian); "The SDS March on Washington" and "Up from Irrelevance," (Spring Studies on the Left); Andrew Hopkins, "Of, By and For the Poor: The New Generation of Student Organizers," (June 19 New Republic).

Weekly Calendar

CLEVELAND

Forum for Aug. 1 canceled.

THE CRISIS OF BLACK LEADERSHIP. Speaker: Robert Vernon, contributor to The Militant. Sunday, Aug. 8, 7:30 p.m.

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM AND THE BLACK REVOLUTION. Speaker: Paul Boutelle, SWP candidate for Manhattan Borough President. Sunday, Aug. 15, 7:30 p.m.

All forums at Debs Hall, 5927 Euclid Ave., Tel. 391-1425. Contrib. 50c. Aup. Cleveland Militant Forum

DETROIT

THE HISTORY OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN AMERICA SINCE 1940. Four talks by Harry Ring, editorial staff of The Militant. Saturday, July 31 and Sunday, Aug. 1.

THE CRISIS IN BLACK LEADERSHIP TODAY: Lecture IV in a five-part series on The Negro in American History. Speaker: Robert Vernon, contributor, The Militant, author of The Black Ghetto. Fri., Aug. 6, 8 p.m. 3737 Woodward. Aup. Friday Night Socialist Forum.

LOS ANGELES

THEODORE EDWARDS presents a Marxist view of the news in his biweekly radio commentary. Tues., Aug. 3, 6:30 p.m. (repeated Wed., Aug. 4, 9 a.m.) KPFF-FM (90.7 on your dial).

NEW YORK

CUBA: REVOLUTION IN PERMANENCE. Speaker: Ed Shaw, national organizational secretary, Socialist Workers Party. Fri., July 30, 8:30 p.m. 116 University Pl. Contrib. \$1, students 50c. Aup. Militant Labor Forum.

MARK LANE, attorney for the defendants, speaks on The Statue of Liberty Case. Fri., Aug. 6, 8:30 p.m. 116 University Pl. Contrib. \$1, students 50c. Aup. Militant Labor Forum.

A Correction

It has been brought to our attention that the final scoreboard for The Militant Fund Campaign, printed in our June 28 issue, did not give the contribution from Seattle due to a typographical error, although this contribution was included in the total. Seattle had a quota of \$500, which was paid in full and on time, putting Seattle at 100 percent.

Dorothy Johnson Dies

NEW YORK — Dorothy Johnson, former business manager of The Militant, died here July 3. She was 41 years old and had been a devoted and active member of the Socialist Workers Party for the past 20 years.

Born Dorothy Jane Hilberg in Ashland, Ky., on Oct. 4, 1923, and raised in that state, she attended Berea College, a work college originally founded by abolitionists for Kentucky mountaineers. The second World War was in progress during her student days at Berea and she expressed her opposition to the slaughter by becoming a militant pacifist and member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Later she moved to Los Angeles, Calif., and came in contact with revolutionary socialist ideas as a result of the mass antifascist demonstrations in 1945 in that city against the racist Gerald L. K. Smith. She joined the local branch of the Socialist Workers Party, which had initiated those demonstrations.

From the moment she joined the party at the age of 21 she was one of its most active and talented members. She worked as a waitress and as a sewing machine operator and was a member of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. During the 1947 ILGWU organizing drive in Los Angeles she was a picket captain in the Cal Tex strike. Her activities attracted such attention she was offered a paid position with the United Auto Workers. She declined this offer so she could continue to devote her full energies to the Socialist Workers Party.

She came to New York as a delegate to the 1948 national convention of the party, stayed on to help found the youth branch in New York, and was one of the stalwarts of the party during the difficult period of McCarthyism. She was outstanding at almost any task she undertook, from selling subscriptions to The Militant to collecting signatures on peti-



Dorothy Johnson

tions putting socialist candidates on the ballot, and was an exceptionally good student of Marxism.

She served as full-time business manager of The Militant until a serious illness—she suffered a nervous breakdown—overtaken her in 1955. Even after that, except for brief periods in the hospital, she remained an active party member and was always involved in some important assignment such as bookkeeping or doing a research project. She suffered a relapse recently and her death was due to suicide by gas.

In her last years, Dorothy kept to herself for the most part and did her work for the party quietly, often coming to the headquarters on a Sunday when no one else was around. She had been in the headquarters doing some bookkeeping just a week before her death. She was beloved by her many friends and will be remembered by her colleagues in the party as one of their finest comrades.

... Deacons

(Continued from Page 1)
and bricks. Sixteen Negroes were taken to the hospital with injuries.

BROWNSVILLE, Tenn., July 14 — No trace has been found of Robert Waller, a 16-year-old Negro who disappeared in Haywood County after objections by some white farmers to the fact that the youth and six other Negroes had federal Agriculture Dept. jobs.

The seven Negroes were the first of their race to be employed by the local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS). Their job is measuring cotton acreage. Waller was at work July 7 when he was picked up by Deputy Sheriff John George (Buddy) Sullivan and charged with "indecent exposure." Sullivan claims the youth escaped.

Robert Smith, manager of the Haywood County ASCS office said Waller "did good work, his attitude was good and he never gave us a minute's trouble." Just before his arrest, Waller had measured the fields of three well-known Negro farmers, all of whom testify that the youth had talked and laughed with them and behaved normally.

REVIEWS and REPORTS

THE SOUTHERN FREEDOM MOVEMENT IN PERSPECTIVE

by Ann Braden. Monthly Review, July-August, 1965 issue. 96 pp., \$1.

This article, which takes up the entire issue, is an historical survey of the modern Southern struggle together with discussion of some of the major problems and arguments within the movement. In both respects, while not complete, it is an exceptionally sensitive and thought provoking contribution by an active participant who is also fine writer.

For those not familiar with the history of the Southern freedom struggle since the Second World War, this will be an invaluable outline. For those who remember the events, reading about them all together adds perspective. For those who would understand the thinking of the activists in the movement, this article is a must.

In it are sketched all the high points of the struggle since the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. The role of such important, but often obscured figures as E. D. Nixon of Montgomery, as well as the contributions of all the major organizations are dealt with in an objective — if largely uncritical — way. Included are the birth of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference; the student sit-in revolt of 1960-61; the Nashville student movement which produced many SCLC and SNCC leaders; the Freedom Rides; Robert Williams and the Monroe movement; McComb, Mississippi; the mass movement in Albany, Ga.; the Birmingham demonstrations of 1963; the March on Washington (including the censorship of the speech of SNCC Chairman John Lewis); the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; the Mississippi Summer Project of 1964; the confrontation of the Atlantic City Democratic Party convention; and Selma, Ala.

Among the issues touched upon for discussion are: nonviolence; self defense (the author warns against condemning those, such as the Deacons, who organize it); community work; the question of leadership; red-baiting; black and white participation; "coalition politics"; and the influence of socialist ideas within the movement.

—Fred Halstead

VIET-REPORT: An Emergency News Bulletin on Southeast Asian Affairs. Published by VIET-REPORT, Inc., 133 West 72nd St., New York, N. Y. 10023. Year subscription \$5; single copy 50c; special rates for bulk purchases.

VIET-REPORT is a new monthly magazine whose first issue was published this month. The sponsors of the magazine are listed as the University Committee to Protest the War, and three individuals: Henry W. Edgerton, George Rawitscher and Benjamin Spock.

The first issue is full of useful information about Vietnam and the war. "Inside Vietcong Territory" by Georges Chaffard is the report of a respected French journalist who interviewed many leaders of the National Liberation Front and traveled in the liberated zones. The account was first published in the French newsweekly *L'Express* in April.

Bernard B. Fall, an expert on the war and author of *The Two Viet-Nams*, has contributed an article citing facts and figures which show that the war in Vietnam is already just as big and brutal as

the Korean war was — especially for the civilians.

Staughton Lynd reviews two books on the war in Vietnam written from opposing points of view: *The Making of a Quagmire*, by David Halberstam; and *Vietnam, Inside Story of the Guerrilla War*, by Wilfred Burchett. Other contributors to the issue include: John McDermott, instructor in philosophy at Long Island University; Stanley Millet, chairman of the department of political science at Adelphi University; and Martin Nicolaus, a graduate student in sociology at Brandeis University.

Though most of the magazine is devoted to information about Vietnam, a letter from Staughton Lynd offering suggestions about what the antiwar movement should do next is of special interest. His suggestions for this summer are:

"That professors organize themselves in a parallel Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hold the hearings in Washington the Senate committee has failed to hold, and continue until Bundy shows up.

"That there be convened in America a new crimes tribunal, made up of men whose spiritual authority is unquestionable such as Vinoba Bhave, Danilo Dolci, Pastor Niemoller, Michael Scott, and hopefully Martin Luther King, who would conduct an inquiry into the moral responsibility for the horror in Vietnam.

"That there come together in Washington a new continental congress made up of representatives from community unions, Freedom Parties and campus groups, which would say in effect: This is a desperate situation; our government no longer represents us; let us see what needs to be done.

"Under the aegis of this congress mass civil disobedience could take place on such symbolic dates as Hiroshima Day and Labor Day."

It is to be hoped that VIET REPORT will be able to play a vital role in providing both accurate information about Vietnam and an open forum where the policies of the antiwar movement can be discussed.

—David Herman

Committee Opposed To War in Vietnam Organized in N.Y.C.

NEW YORK — In this city, as in many other places across the country, various committees to protest the war in Vietnam popped up after the April 17 March on Washington. In New York, a city-wide group, called the New York Committee to End the War in Vietnam, has been formed.

According to Sue Schwartz, a leader of the new organization, over 200 people are already actively involved in the Committee's work.

The Committee is composed of six different neighborhood groups, a research committee and a central coordinating office. The neighborhood groups carry on such activities as distributing leaflets at movies, supermarkets and parks; setting up tables on sidewalks with information on Vietnam; speaking at churches, civil rights groups, teenage groups, etc.; and holding street meetings and seminars.

New Yorkers interested in contacting this Committee can find them at 1165 Broadway. Phone: 889-5793.

Interview with Eugene Genovese

Professor Attacked for Teach-in Stand

By Evelyn Reed

Professor Eugene D. Genovese of the history department at Rutgers, the state university of New Jersey, and an editor of *Studies on the Left*, has been under attack for his condemnation of Johnson's "dirty war" in Vietnam and his forthright sympathy with the National Liberation Front revolutionists. He was one of eleven faculty members, including Professor Alexander (a member of the Socialist Party's national committee) and Professor Susman of the history department, who participated in a teach-in at the university last April.

The campaign against him has become a focal point in the defense of academic freedom in the great debate on U.S. foreign policy agitating the campuses today. Here are some highlights of a recent interview with Professor Genovese.

How did the Rutgers teach-in develop?

Our teach-in was initiated by Professor Zenchelsky of the chemistry department. It began at midnight on Thursday, April 22 and continued until eight the next morning. Almost a thousand students crowded into Scott Hall; hundreds of others couldn't get in. Almost all stayed through the night. This turnout surprised the organizers since Rutgers has been regarded as a conservative campus with very little political activity.

What were the principal views presented and how did the students react?

Many of the students came with their minds made up in advance. About half had a strong antiwar sentiment; others had varying degrees of reservations. By six in the morning, apart from a small group of strident right-wingers, it's fair to say that the sentiment had shifted heavily over to the antiwar position.

Professor Alexander moderately supported U.S. policy. The most aggressive defender of the administration was William Fitzpatrick, English professor and adviser to the Rutgers-Douglass Conservative Club. He bluntly stated: "We are fighting in Vietnam not to save our 'little brown brothers' but to save ourselves." His war-hawk posture was scathingly indicted by history department Professor Susman who received three standing ovations from the great majority of the audience.

What did you say on Vietnam?

I made clear that my views were based upon a Marxist and Socialist position. I stated that I did not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory — I welcomed it. My general theme was that socialism on a world scale held out the best hope for economic and social progress, for political and intellectual freedom, and for an enduring peace. While I thought the war in Vietnam could be brought to a conclusion, we would have to face many more Vietnams until capitalism, a system that throttles peoples everywhere, was replaced by socialism, which has no need for such oppressions.

How did the students receive these remarks?

The speech was, I think, generously applauded. This did not necessarily indicate support for everything I said but rather appreciation for the frank presentation of a socialist viewpoint. In the following days dozens of students came to the history department office and congratulated us for holding the panel. They felt very strongly it was the kind of discussion which had been missing for so long from the campus.

Who has mounted the campaign against you?

There has been considerable right-wing effort in the attack. The Birch Society is quite powerful in New Jersey. At their state convention in May, the Young Republicans passed a resolution demanding an investigation of teach-

ing at Rutgers in the light of my speech. Then the Amvets passed a similar resolution saying I should be thrown out of Rutgers and not allowed to teach anywhere. There have been the usual "crank" letters written to the newspapers against communist professors "corrupting" the minds of the youth at a state university.

A two-man informal legislative committee investigated the teach-in and especially my participation and brought in an astounding recommendation. They admitted that there were no grounds for action but called on the Board of Governors to revise its approach to academic freedom. I suspect that there is a long, hard fight ahead.

What has been the attitude of the university administration?

Neither the university officials nor the Board of Governors have said anything about the situation. I have seen no indication of any weakening in their defense of academic freedom up to this point.

My opponents are on untenable grounds since I have never used the classroom as a political soapbox and have had good relations with students of all opinions. I am frankly a socialist although I do not belong to any of the left-wing parties. If I should ever come to wholeheartedly agree with such a party I would not hesitate to join. My present nonmembership is not due to concern about my academic career, but at present my commitments are solely ideological.

What support have you received?

Curiously enough, although a few commentators have launched a barrage against me, the New Jersey press has generally been quite fair. Governor Hughes, while expressing disagreement with my "prejudices and opinions," has upheld my right to teach and hold my opinions. Students have written letters to the politicians and papers backing my right to free speech. I regard this as a healthy sign of the times.

The climate of the academic community today is very different from the 1950's. At that time some university professors were fired; others were humiliated and there was much breast-beating and re-

cantation. While a deepening of the Vietnam war might create a similar hysteria, it is this very war which has shaken up the campuses and produced the teach-ins.

I think the faculties right now are even more determined and effective than the students. Under McCarthyism many of them buckled out of cowardice. This created a terrible conflict of conscience which I hope would deter such a repetition today.

Moreover, the events at Berkeley have had their repercussions. Several legislators have privately commented: "We don't want another California in New Jersey!" We are proud of our work in building Rutgers' reputation as a developing university, particularly in our history department. Any kind of purge would ruin the reputation of the university. No university can hope to attain or keep a national reputation while penalizing teachers for their opinions.

What are the issues in your case?

The prime one of course is the defense of academic freedom. This issue is far clearer in my case than in some others since I am an avowed Marxist on the faculty of a state university.

What prospects do the teach-ins hold for the antiwar movement?

There is a growing determination on campuses across the country to mobilize faculty and students in criticism and opposition to U.S. foreign policy as a whole rather than reacting to each issue as it comes up. Some kind of permanent anti-imperialist organization may well emerge from this trend.

The initiative has generally been taken by individuals who are not socialists but who do feel that American foreign policy is bankrupt. They are worried about nuclear war. They want to see some sanity introduced into the situation. They would like some kind of negotiations with the Soviet Union, China and Cuba. I believe the opportunities for building an antiwar movement on the campuses are far more favorable today than at any previous time.

Two Pamphlets By Rosa Luxemburg

The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions

paper \$1

Socialism and the Churches

25c

Pioneer Publishers
5 East Third St.
New York, N. Y. 10003

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

Summer 1965

Articles on:

South Africa

American Sociology

Soviet Management Reform

50c

116 University Place
New York, N.Y. 10003

Cubans Free Followers Of Posadas

In a letter published in the April issue of the Mexican *Voz Obrera*, J. Posadas, leader of a group which split from the Fourth International several years ago, announced that "all of our Cuban comrades" have been released from prison. Posadas claims to be the head of the world Trotskyist movement, and his followers in Cuba are often referred to as "the Cuban Trotskyists."

Posadas' letter provides few details about the arrest and imprisonment of his followers or how their release was brought about. He does mention that while in prison they were in charge of conducting courses on Marxism for the inmates.

An article in the January-February issue of *Spartacist*, by one of the magazine's supporters who participated in the trip to Cuba by American students last summer, gives a more detailed account, based on interviews with Leon Ferrera, son of the imprisoned leader of the Posadas followers. According to this account, five were arrested during the period from November 1963 through the spring of 1964, and sentenced to terms of from two to nine years in prison. Those involved were: Andrés Alfonso, Florida Fraga, Ricardo Ferrara, Roberto Tejera and Idalberto Ferrera.

THE MILITANT

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN

Managing Editor: BARRY SHEPPARD Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY

Published weekly, except during July and August when published bi-weekly, by The Militant Publishing Ass'n., 116 University Pl., New York 3, N.Y. Phone CH 3-2140. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: \$3 a year; Canadian, \$3.50; foreign, \$4.50. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 29 - No. 28

345

Monday, July 26, 1965

Peking's Opportunism

Peking's unseemly haste in granting recognition to the new militarist regime in Algeria stands in glaring contrast to the June 26 attack on the Boumedienne regime by Fidel Castro (the greater part of which is published in this issue of *The Militant*). Apparently more important to Peking than the threat to the Algerian revolution posed by the right-wing militarists, was the Afro-Asian Conference scheduled for Algiers, which China intended to use as a propaganda platform in its polemic with Moscow.

Chinese recognition of Boumedienne had quick repercussions in Algeria itself. "Students in Algiers," Alexander Werth reports in the *Nation* July 19, "thereupon publicly burned the Chinese flag. The Chinese were in bad company: Syria was the only Arab country that hastened to recognize Boumedienne; among the few other 'Bandung' powers to do so were South Vietnam, Indonesia and Ethiopia."

Not unexpectedly, Peking has already tried to hedge on the issue. In a speech in Cairo, June 24, Chinese Premier Chou felt constrained to "explain" Peking's attitude toward the coup. "A few days ago," he declared, "a revolutionary council was set up in Algeria. This is entirely an internal affair of Algeria. China never interferes in other countries' internal affairs." (*Hsinhua*, June 24)

This is a rather dubious contention if one recalls that China has been engaged in a frenetic public polemic against the Soviet Union for years, and that it was precisely in order to utilize the Bandung Conference in Algiers as a platform for attacking the Kremlin that Peking rushed to recognize Col. Boumedienne.

In stark contrast to this narrow factional approach is Fidel Castro's speech. Admitting that his criticism of Boumedienne might endanger relations between Cuba and Algeria, Castro considered this subordinate to his revolutionary obligation to warn the Algerian people against the dangers inherent in a militarist regime.

In pointing out that the danger of the coup was well known for months beforehand, even to Ben Bella himself, Castro generously attributes Ben Bella's failure to prevent the coup to Ben Bella's "kindness and nobility." Here, too, revolutionary truth must be served.

Ben Bella attempted to stabilize his regime in a typical Bonapartist fashion by balancing himself between the hostile class forces in the Algerian revolution. Instead of deepening the revolutionary consciousness of the masses by developing workers' and peasants' democracy, by extending the agrarian reform, and moving decisively toward nationalizing the still immense capitalist holdings in Algeria, Ben Bella attempted to compromise with antirevolutionary interests against the interests of the masses.

The Boumedienne coup demonstrates in a negative way what the Cuban revolution proves positively, that in the underdeveloped world today, the revolution must be carried through to the end, to a truly socialist conclusion, if it is to survive the deadly threat of counterrevolution.

A Third Continental Congress

Staughton Lynd has raised the idea of a Third Continental Congress against the Vietnam war (see June-July *Liberation*). Such a Congress would be an important step forward for the antiwar movement.

The American people have no say whatever in the determination of whether the U.S. will continue its unjust and brutal intervention in the Vietnamese civil war. Although the sons and brothers of ordinary people will be the ones who die in Vietnam, the decisions about the war are being made behind the backs of the people by a tiny handful of capitalist politicians in Washington.

A Third Continental Congress would, by its very existence, dramatize the fact that the people are not represented in Washington, as they were not represented in London when the first two Continental Congresses were held during the American Revolution, and would raise the idea that the people have the right and should have the power to determine U.S. policy toward Vietnam.

In addition to the antiwar committees, civil rights organizations, tenants' groups, labor unionists opposed to the warmongering of Meany and his cohorts, should all be encouraged to participate in the congress. These groups all have a direct interest in opposing the Vietnam war. The same forces behind the war are the forces which perpetuate racism, defend the system which breeds poverty, press for antiunion laws, and are behind witch hunt and reaction.

All of the socialist and communist parties should be invited to participate, both because their ideas are important to the antiwar movement, and because "anticommunism," which is used as the justification for the war, will be dealt a strong blow thereby.

The Third Continental Congress, if it is organized with due regard to effectiveness and timing, would be a massive demonstration of tens of thousands against the war. The discussions which would take place there would help to unify the movement and chart the next stage of the struggle.

Castro's Speech

[The following excerpt is taken from the unofficial text of the speech Fidel Castro delivered on June 26 to the Cuban students who were scheduled to attend the Ninth World Youth Festival in Algiers. In his talk, Castro explained why the Cuban students would not attend the Festival if it were held in Algeria. Subsequently, the Festival was canceled.]

Following the publication and distribution of this speech in Algeria, the Boumedienne regime, on June 30, closed down *Prensa Latina*, the Cuban press service there.

Full text of the speech may be obtained from the Cuban Mission to the United Nations, 6 East 67 St., New York, N.Y. 10021.]

* * *

We are not going to speak in diplomatic language, we are going to speak in revolutionary language. Diplomatic and revolutionary language are not always in contradiction. Sometimes they are in contradiction, and other times they are identical. In this case we will forget the diplomatic aspects of the question and confine ourselves to the clearly revolutionary aspect.

Why beat around the bush? We cannot discuss this question without offending a few people even though there is no intention to offend anyone.

We cannot discuss this question without creating enmity. But in these circumstances what is important is the correct point of view, a correct and objective analysis as far as possible.

In the first place, the military revolt which overthrew the revolutionary government of Ben Bella is not and cannot be described by anyone as a revolutionary uprising.

Crisis Within Revolution

It is true that the crisis arose within the Revolution and among the ranks of the revolutionaries; it is also true that the men who headed that uprising played a prominent role in the struggle for the independence of Algeria; and it is also true that among those figures there are men who had maintained a good revolutionary line up to this moment, and other figures who although they have played a distinguished role in the revolutionary process did not have a good revolutionary position.

In our relations with Algeria we made contacts with the revolutionaries, with the representatives of that country, considering them all as part of the same thing. We met many Algerian personalities, many of them visited our country; many of them discussed and held wide exchanges of information with representatives of our country during our visits there or their visits here. Some of them are today in one camp and some in the other; some of them are victims and some victimizers.

But, forgetting names, figures or personalities, the description of a military revolt as revolutionary or not depends essentially on the facts. There can be a revolutionary military revolt and in that case it would be more correct to describe it as a revolutionary movement rather than a revolt. A revolt can also be something that is more crudely described as a putsch, a military seizure of power or a right-wing military coup.

The objective against which the revolt is directed is, in the first place, one of the elements that determine how it is described although its description will not depend on the objective against which it is directed but also on the ends it pursues.

Over a decade ago, another North African country, the United Arab Republic, was ruled by a king named Farouk, a representa-



Fidel Castro

tive of a feudal monarchy and of foreign monopoly interests. It was a regime which represented the most crude exploitation of the workers and peasants, and in those circumstances a military movement emerged which led to the overthrow of the king, to the establishment of a republic and to the true independence of the country.

That movement was led by a military man and carried out by military men. That revolt from the very moment it took place could unquestionably be described as a revolutionary military uprising. The mere fact that it was directed against the most anachronistic form of government and against the representatives of the interests that exploited the country, made that movement, from the first moment, a revolutionary movement, or a revolutionary military uprising or, simply, a revolution.

Those circumstances were radically different from those in which the Algerian revolt is taking place. In Egypt, the progressive forces in the army rose against a social system and the government that represented it; revolutionaries rose against supporters of feudalism and against imperialists.

Are these the circumstances in which the Algerian revolt took place? No, it is, in the first place, a painful clash within the revolutionary ranks; a painful conflict within the revolution, in which arms and force are used against revolutionaries and not against a feudal king, not against a representative of imperialist interests, not against a spokesman of the exploiters and reactionaries, not against an enemy of the people, but against the representative of the Algerian Revolution, against a revolutionary and anti-imperialist fighter, against a fighter whose position in the international arena in the struggle of the peoples against imperialism, won in a few years great prestige in his country and abroad.

The weapons of the revolution and of the people are turned against one who unquestionably enjoyed the support of the people; against one who unquestionably represented the will of the majority of the people.

This consideration of what the defeated government represented, the government against which the military revolt was directed, does not have anything to do with passing judgment on the work of that government, does not have anything to do with the achievements or with the errors that men and governments, made up of men, inevitably commit.

There is no attempt in this to make a detailed analysis of a number of years of government, of what was done, good or bad, because this is a question open to argument, a matter of opinion, of judgment.

One could have an opinion on whether more could or could not have been done, on whether they

did more or less than they could. But what we are talking about today are facts, not opinions or judgments, but facts accepted by everyone.

Who could deny that Ben Bella was the leader of the Algerian people? Who could deny the historic part he played in the independence of Algeria and in the Algerian Revolution? What government, what party ever said before the treacherous overthrow of President Ben Bella that Ben Bella was not a revolutionary, that Ben Bella was not an interpreter of the feelings of Algeria, that Ben Bella was a traitor to the revolution, or that Ben Bella was pro-imperialist, a conservative, a reactionary, a despot?

The Conference of Afro-Asian Countries, as well as the World Youth Festival, was going to be held in Algeria. No one ever proposed to hold it in South Vietnam, in the capital of the pro-imperialist puppets; no one proposed to hold it in South Korea or in Formosa or in the Malaysian Federation, or in any of those countries where the governments represent antisocial and antinational interests.

By almost unanimous agreement of all progressive and revolutionary movements, it was decided that the Conference should be held in Algeria, that the Festival should be held in Algeria. No one, no government, no party, ever said that this man was a turncoat or a traitor or a despot or an enemy of the Algerian people.

I am basing myself on realities, not on opinions but on facts and truths universally accepted.

The day following the inglorious coup, a delicate situation arose for all governments and for all parties: what to do? And this question also involved us. What to do and why and what our attitude was to be towards these events.

A government very friendly to us had been overthrown, a government with which we maintained the best of relations, because we saw in it the representative of the Algerian Revolution. We are not looking at this problem in the light of friendship as some have tried to insinuate. No. We are looking at it in the light of truth, of our principles, of dignity.

U.S. Hostility

Our relations with President Ben Bella were simply the expression of our relations with and our sympathy for the Algerian Revolution and the Algerian people.

It is true that our people felt a great admiration for President Ben Bella personally, because of course we had not forgotten, it is not something that could be easily forgotten, the gesture of the revolutionary leader of Algeria, the President of the new state which had won its independence after seven years of heroic struggle, on the eve of those critical days of October, 1962.

In an atmosphere of growing tension he arrived in the United States, invited by the government of that country, the country which maintained such a high degree of hostility towards us, the country which judges men and governments and adopts reprisals against them on the basis of how friendly or unfriendly they are towards Cuba. It must not be forgotten that the representative of Algeria, a country which had been devastated and scorched by war, rejecting all pressure from the imperialist government of the United States, without having anything to expect from us, or to receive from us, spontaneously and without any hesitation accepted an invitation to visit our country; to travel from Washington to Havana, thus affronting the

Each on Algerian Coup

imperialists precisely during those critical and tense days.

We recall our contacts with that leader, his decency, his kind and revolutionary character, expressed not in words but in deeds, because a true revolutionary attitude is not expressed in words but in actions.

And it was not a case of mere words but of a deeply revolutionary gesture of solidarity, so well understood by our people that they gave our visitor one of the warmest welcomes ever extended in our country to a foreign visitor.

But we also recall the embarrassing situation in which we found ourselves with our visitor because the (October) crisis was taking form. The U.S. government had put forward its points of view in answer to the concern expressed by the visitor over the hostility of the United States towards Cuba. And they had told him that if the weapons in Cuba were not offensive weapons there would be no problems, but that if the weapons were offensive then there would be problems.

No Obligation Involved

This was for us an unacceptable description of weapons. Because the sovereignty of a country does not involve, and cannot involve in any way, any obligation to give an account of its armaments.

The United States has signed military agreements with Turkey, which borders on the Soviet Union and is closer geographically to the Soviet Union than Cuba is to the United States, and with Japan and with Italy and with many other countries. Under these military agreements the United States has stationed in those countries the kind of nuclear weapons it saw fit, ranging from strategic missiles with nuclear warheads to bases for atomic submarines or for atomic bombers. Neither the United States nor the governments with which it signed those agreements admitted that anyone could ask them to render an account nor did they consider themselves under an obligation to render an account to anyone.

That is why we never accepted these premises and never agreed to them. We are not going to recall the details of those days. To us they were the expression of the most extraordinary heroism and of the greatest dignity that a nation could show.

But we are not going to go into the background of tactical errors in the political field, of public statements that could have played into the hands of our enemy. When one has the right to do something and truth is on one's side, there is no need to resort to a lie. It should never be necessary to lie.

But the fact is that the imperialists had worked out the doctrine of offensive and nonoffensive weapons. We perfectly well understood that they could be strategic or nonstrategic weapons; nuclear or conventional weapons.

But in the days when President Ben Bella visited us, very close to the October crisis, the whole plan for the military strengthening of our nation was in full swing and the establishment of the nuclear weapons was near completion. What should we do with our guest? Could we accept in silence the explanations he gave us about what he had been told by the imperialists? Could we let him leave our country without saying a word, without explaining to him the storm that was approaching, and without telling him the truth? Could we reveal secrets or facts that should be kept rigorously secret? Could we reveal the extent of the military strengthening of our nation, and the nature of this strengthening?

It was really a delicate and embarrassing situation. And what did we do? We did not tell him we were going to have nuclear

weapons, but we allowed him to understand it. We explained to him the philosophy of our position, the truth about our situation in relation to U.S. imperialism, its constant interference in our affairs, its implacable hostility, its aggressive plans, its criminal aims to crush our homeland, the dangers hanging over our country, the danger of a conventional war whenever it pleased them, plus the danger of a nuclear war if such a war broke out for any reason in any part of the world.

And we explained to him how we were directing our strategy toward the simplification of this problem, to get out of this alternative and have only one risk over our heads, the risk of a thermonuclear war that we would have to face anyway, if such a war broke out for any reason anywhere.

And not many words are necessary in the case of one who understands well. And Ben Bella showed himself to be a person of magnificent and intelligent understanding.

Of course, that was not the only reason for the presence of strategic weapons, since we were not thinking only of our purely national interests. Our thinking when the decision was taken, was not on the security of our country alone but was essentially on the security of the whole socialist camp, the security and strengthening of all the enemies of imperialism.

And it must be said that, when the decision was taken, the fundamental concern of the Cuban leaders was not the security of our country but the total coincidence of our national policy and our international policy; the full identity, without contradictions of any kind, in our revolutionary policy, because our homeland and the socialist camp would both be strengthened.

Of course, all this can be the subject of multiple discussions, because everything can be discussed. Whether or not it meant a strategic strengthening of the socialist camp, whether or not missiles were needed here, whether they were "hard" or "soft," that is, whether they were underground or on the surface. But, without trying to settle the question which history will have to clarify, the unquestionable fact is that the strategic missiles in Cuba had an incomparably shorter distance to travel than the strategic missiles in the Soviet Union.

We believe that this is not the time, that it is up to history to clarify the intentions of each and every one of those who acted on that occasion. Changes in governments take place, new situations arise, men pass, facts remain and history will weigh the actions of men.

Understood Position

But I say simply this, in our concept, and not without a very solid basis, the presence of the missiles in Cuba meant the strengthening of the power of the whole socialist camp.

I say this so as not to leave this delicate question without clarifying one or two points that should not remain obscure. But essentially I was referring, and that is why it comes up today, to the practical problem we faced with Ben Bella's visit at that moment, a few hours after he had talked with the President of the United States. What was our attitude and what was his? What did he understand? He understood quickly and correctly. He told us that things were all right, that he understood our position.

And there is something more. When the Cuban-Algerian Communiqué was drafted, and when these communiqués are drafted more radical and less radical positions always appear, and the position of the (Algerian) Foreign



ALGERIAN MASSES pour out of Casbah in demonstration during war for liberation from French imperialism. Their struggle for socialism continues.

Ministry was not then the most radical, the clearest and most radical positions in the Communiqué were those of Ben Bella, not of the Algerian Foreign Ministry.

I don't remember whether Bouteflika was the Foreign Minister or whether it was his predecessor, but I recall that the checking of the Joint Communiqué took place very near the time of Ben Bella's departure. The Communiqué had to reflect the ideas of both countries, and for our part we did not, and could not, in any way raise issues likely to make the acceptance of the Communiqué difficult for our visitor.

I remember that when the final Communiqué was read, I will never forget, that in recalling the conversation we had had on offensive and nonoffensive weapons — and I forgot to tell you that as well as that explanation of the alternatives we also explained our position on the description of weapons as offensive and defensive — in recalling that conversation which was undoubtedly the most important question we had dealt with, Ben Bella said to us: "A phrase has to be added to the Communiqué, that Cuba has the right to take any measure it deems fit to defend its security."

And that phrase, more or less as I have quoted it, must be there in the records, in that Communiqué. It was on his initiative, showing just how well and how clearly he understood our position, and how he roused in us sufficient confidence, sufficient gratitude for his gesture at that time that, without being either casuistical or concrete, we did not hesitate to explain the philosophy and the base of our position, and everything else he deduced himself. Hence he got to know a lot about an extraordinary, important secret when he visited our country.

The relations and friendship between the two peoples became greater and greater. Later, circumstances arose, moments of crisis for Algeria, difficult moments for the Algerian nation, when they asked for our help. And men and arms from our country, crossing the Atlantic in record time, arrived at Algeria ready to fight alongside the Algerian revolutionaries. And when our men were there, they were with those who today are divided. Those who today have taken up arms against Ben Bella in a fratricidal struggle, were then at his side.

At that time, distance did not keep us from being the first to arrive. Proletarian internationalism in deeds, in deeds, and not in cheap speech-making. We, the small country, constantly threatened by the imperialists, parted with some of our most important

weapons and sent them to the Algerian people. And the deeds were strengthening relations and friendship between the two peoples, in their best and most glorious moments.

Perhaps, but unfortunately there is no doubt those weapons that one day left our country for the Revolution and the defense of the Algerian people, in a glorious moment of brotherly solidarity, have been employed at an inglorious moment, in a fratricidal act, against the Algerian Government and people.

But what is important, what remains, are the deeds that go on forging a history in the relations between two countries and two revolutions. It will be the job of the Algerian historians, or of any other country — because everyone has the right to have an opinion about what happens anywhere — to assess the work of Ben Bella at the head of the Algerian Government.

Many people will be satisfied and many people will not be satisfied, but some and perhaps many, and among them ourselves, have not the slightest doubt of the extraordinary good faith with which Ben Bella worked, of the honesty of his intentions and of his position at international meetings where Cuba was present. There were also exceptional witnesses to the fact that the most revolutionary positions were represented by Ben Bella and not by Bouteflika, the Foreign Minister whose insubordination marked the culminating moment in the overthrow of Ben Bella. There is no doubt at all that this intellectual of the military seizure of power is not a revolutionary but a man of the right and known as such by the Algerian people and the whole world. A man of the right, an enemy of socialism, that is, an enemy of the Algerian Revolution, although in their proclamation as in all such proclamations, a certain revolutionary language is used, not a completely revolutionary language, since there is not a word about the national liberation movements, of help to the national liberation movements, help about which Ben Bella never bargained, solidarity which Ben Bella never refused.

And this gentleman, spokesman and one of the men behind the military seizure of power, is a man of the right, a reactionary. And I believe that these facts serve to define the situation.

And at these international meetings the position of Ben Bella was the most revolutionary. It's not easy to judge and we have to confine ourselves to the facts. Everyone will have his own opinion, everyone has his own style, others perhaps would have done

things differently. Perhaps with a little more shrewdness, and less kindness and nobility, Ben Bella would not have been a victim and would have foreseen the danger, the danger which we unfortunately did foresee. Because we saw that around Boumedienne there was a clique gathering, we saw that around Boumedienne there were officers who liked to discredit Ben Bella. And here, unfortunately, on many occasions when delegations visited us, our comrades saw with sorrow that a militarist caste, obviously influenced by militarist conceptions, was showing disdain for the Algerian President.

Naturally we were not going to spread the gossip because this was also quite a general attitude among the men close to Boumedienne. I am not judging Boumedienne. Let us not judge him for what he has done now, so that history may judge him for what he has done and what he may do. He is a very silent man, of few words. It is difficult to know what he is thinking, but his supporters were neither quiet nor lacking in words.

And unfortunately the military seizure of power took place. If Ben Bella had been shrewder and less ingenuous, there would not have been a military seizure of power, and the masses would have disarmed the men behind the revolt, but the unfortunate events took place. I repeat, we base ourselves not on exaggerations but on what we know for a fact, and it does not involve an analysis of the work of Ben Bella, but an analysis of his intentions, of his characteristics, of his decency, of his nobility, of his goodness, of his passion for the Revolution and for Algeria, demonstrated on many occasions.

No Political Opportunism

And now, in view of the events, were we going to ignore all this history, all the ties which bound us to the Algerian Revolution and its most legitimate representatives, to abuse the fallen hero because he no longer governs in Algeria and to try at all costs to win the support of those who assumed power at the point of the sword? No, because we would be engaging in the most repugnant political opportunism.

Could we express our support for the military seizure of power? No, because in the conditions of Algeria, in the middle of the revolutionary process, we find no possible justification for the way in which they acted. We could, at the most, wait and see if the unlikely and almost impossible happened, that after using treacherous and dishonorable methods, they later showed, without any possible doubt, really revolutionary intentions, showed that they are leading and not following the Algerian Revolution.

In that case we could exonerate them or be tolerant of their very serious mistakes of today, because of the way they might be able to remedy them tomorrow, but it is not possible to expect this. It is not probable, it could be possible, but it is not probable.

Let's imagine that these gentlemen were even more revolutionary, that the Algerian Revolution appeared backward and show that they wanted to deepen it, to go further. Let us assume for a moment that the arguments or the motives that inspired their action had a base, at least, in intention. Let us imagine, as a hypothesis, that they were right. When you are right, is it necessary to resort to treason? Is a military revolt the only road open to them? Was their situation that of Nasser in Egypt against King Farouk? Not at all. Many of the Cabinet Ministers are still there. If it is true that the promoters of the coup represented the will of the

(Continued on Page 6)

FREEDOM FIGHTERS

José Martí: Apostle of the Cuban Revolution

By Richard Garza

José Martí, one of history's finest human beings, was born in Havana, Cuba, on Jan. 28, 1853, the son of immigrants from Spain. Poet, dramatist, epic journalist and intellectual in the best sense of the word, he was also the leader of the final struggles of Latin American countries to achieve independence from Spain.

He was the first to understand the danger North American imperialism posed to the liberty of the Americas, and was the inspirer of the Cuban revolution which took power in 1959 and which became the first socialist revolution of the New World.

Fidel Castro, in the speech before the court while on trial for his July 26, 1953, attack on the Batista tyranny, said: "They prevented books by Martí from reaching my hands. It seems as if the prison censorship considered them too subversive. Or could it be because I had said that Martí is the mind behind the July 26 . . . There are Cubans who have fallen in defense of his doctrine, youths who in magnificent homage came to die by his grave, to offer their blood and life so that he may go on living in the soul of our country."

The inspirer of these words was a leader of the independence struggles of Cuba, Puerto Rico and Santo Domingo in the last decades of the 19th century.

At the age of only 17 Martí had been sentenced to six years at hard labor for advocating freedom and independence for Cuba. His sentence was later commuted to exile in Spain.

There he supported the struggle, then in progress, of the Spanish people to abolish the monarchy and establish democratic liberties. Even after the republican defeat, he spoke at a public affair for the benefit of the widows and orphans of the republicans who had fallen in battle. Though poor and in bad health because of his prison treatment, he finished college in Spain. After his sentence was up, he visited England and France, and went on to Mexico.

There Martí demonstrated the literary talent that places him among the distinguished men of letters of the Americas. In Mexico he came in contact with the most advanced thinking of Latin America, and came to view that area as one country "from the Rio Grande to the woodlands of Patagonia."

Left Country

The seizure of power in Mexico by Porfirio Diaz in 1876 forced Martí to leave the country and he returned briefly to Cuba, using his mother's name. He was soon back in Mexico and lived in and traveled through Central America teaching, writing and observing. He married a Cuban, Carmen Zayas Bazan, but it was not until the amnesty of 1878 that he was able to return to Cuba, where his son was born.

He continued his outspoken advocacy of independence and was forced to flee to France, from where he went to New York and on to Venezuela, only to have to leave after a run-in with the dictator Guzman Blanco. By the time he returned to the U.S. in 1881, he had served in several Latin American universities as professor of English, French, Italian, and German literature, the history of philosophy and other subjects, and was a leading intellectual.

But it was in the U.S. that he acquired the knowledge and understanding that placed him foremost among his contemporaries in the struggle for independence in Latin America. He lived in the U.S. through the 1880's and early '90's when the country was being rapidly transformed from an agrarian to an industrial nation. He observed at first hand the ruthlessness of U.S. capital, its cor-

ruption of the government, and he wrote of the U.S. workers, then unorganized: "Their ailments stem from the insolence and contempt of organized capital, from its illegitimate combinations, from the system of unequal distribution of profits that keeps the worker in his perpetual state of destitution."

Martí wrote for leading Latin American newspapers from New York and through these years described North America, its people, institutions, culture and leading events. These writings, among the best on the U.S. by any author of the time, are still studied in Latin America, but unfortunately are almost unknown here. They include a moving defense of the Haymarket martyrs.

Martí was sought out as a spokesman for Latin America in the U.S. Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay named him their consul in New York, while literary societies paid him tribute. It was as a delegate to the 1891 International Monetary Council in Washington that he first crossed swords with the U.S. government. The U.S. was pressing to establish silver as the equal of gold in international finance and hoping to line

up the Latin American republics to force this unsound policy on Europe. Martí became the champion of the nations with nothing to gain from this proposal put forward in the interests of U.S. silver companies and banks. His report, delivered in Spanish and English, was accepted and the State Department was forced to admit defeat.

Organized Party

Meanwhile, Martí was a tireless propagandist for Cuban independence among the exiles living in scattered groups from Boston to Key West. In 1892 he turned to direct organization of the revolution. As a student of U.S. politics he recognized with growing apprehension the formulation of policy in Washington to annex Cuba and rob it of its independence at the moment of the inevitable break with Spain.

He resigned his many positions and threw himself into organizing the Cuban Revolutionary Party, welding together the diverse independence forces and gaining the support of the generals who had led the previous struggle in the war of 1868-78. Cuban tobacco workers in the U.S. contributed

from their meager wages to launch the fight. The party included a Puerto Rican section, for the general view then was that the struggle of both islands was one and the same.

He published a newspaper, *Patria*, and though his health was failing he traveled up and down the East Coast of the U.S., and into Central America and the Antilles, conferring, organizing, and raising funds. He became known as "Apostle" of the revolution.

Martí knew he was racing with time, for the enemy was not only Spain, but the growing might of the U.S. in its developing imperialist phase. Even the confiscation by U.S. authorities in December, 1894, of the arms so painstakingly gathered, did not prevent the revolution from beginning in Baire in February, 1895. In May, Martí was killed in battle.

He never lived to see Cuba free, but he inspired others to go on — on to defeat the Spanish, and on 64 years later to shake off the yoke of Yankee imperialism. And it was his inspiration.

On the night before his death, in his last letter, Martí wrote that



José Martí

he saw his duty as "preventing in time, through the independence of Cuba, the United States expansion over the Antilles so as to descend with that added weight upon the other lands of the Americas . . . Preventing the opening in Cuba, through its annexation by the imperialists, of the road that must be barred and which we are barring with our blood, of annexation of all the nations of our America, by the violent and brutal North which despises us . . . I have lived in the belly of the monster and I know its guts; and mine is the sling of David."

... Fidel Castro's Speech on the Recent Algerian Coup

(Continued from Page 5)

people and if it was true that they were right, why did they resort to a military seizure of power? Why did they not raise the problem before the masses, before the people? Why did they not take up the problem within the Party, within the ranks of the revolutionaries?

How could we, Marxist-Leninists, accept, in the specific conditions of Algeria, a military seizure of power carried out treacherously at night, which reminds us so much of March 10 [the military coup by dictator Batista in 1952], both by the hour and the way in which it took place and by the forms of repression already being used against the people — soldiers, fire trucks, shooting, beating and police cars with howling sirens.

With deep sorrow it reminds us of the days following the 10th of March. It would not be correct to say that the Algerian military seizure of power is similar to that of March 10 in the composition of its forces. No. But in the methods used it is as similar as one drop of water to another. And it has to be similar, because whenever soldiers move against the will of the people, repression arises; and repression against the people, against the masses, is very similar anywhere, at any time.

If they thought they were right and were the interpreters of the will of the majority, why did they not go to the masses, why did they not go to the Party? If in addition to force and the military commands, they were right and had the support of the people, why did they resort to force?

Wrong Procedure

Why did they not explain the problem to the masses and to the political organization of the revolutionary masses? And I think that anyone who is really convinced that he is right and that he represents the will of the people would not lack the courage to take the problem to the people and to their representative institutions.

Those who are not sure of being right or of interpreting the will of the people resort to the only means open to them at a given moment, to force. And we, as Marxist-Leninists, cannot justify this military procedure against the masses and against the Party.

Aside from what they may do afterwards, even if they were more revolutionary than Karl Marx himself, we would not re-

frain from telling them, while recognizing their virtues, of their errors and the wrong they have done, of the damage to the Algerian Revolution that may arise from their conduct, of the damage to the revolutionary movement in Africa and other parts of the world; of the mistrust that they may arouse in other liberated countries of Africa and how unfortunate it is to establish on that continent the procedure of military seizure of power in the middle of a revolutionary process.

And if they really would like to be more revolutionary how could they accomplish these more revolutionary intentions? Could they do, with a divided people, what Ben Bella, full of good intentions, could not do with a united people? Could they with a divided people face the imperialist danger? Could they wage the hard battles, the hard battles that a process of radicalization of a revolution inevitably involves? How could we have waged those hard battles with a divided people? Battles that we have won as a united people, with all the forces of a united people?

How are they going to arouse energies without the masses? Will they arouse them in the barracks? No. The energy that emanates from the barracks, divorced from the people, will never be sufficient to resist the power of the imperialists which can only be met by the tremendous revolutionary energy and strength of the people, of a united people.

To make the revolution more radical in those conditions would be extraordinarily difficult; of course, it would not be impossible. But to face those very difficult battles and those very difficult situations would require on the part of those who have replaced Ben Bella a political talent and a revolutionary audacity which Bouteflika and Company do not seem to have; would require support not of the conservatives but of the revolutionary people, the support of the workers, the farmers, the students. And I don't see how anyone can win the support of those masses by using their rifle butts and firing at them; I doubt that the support of the masses can be won by those who do not believe in the masses, who are contemptuous of the strength of the masses and try to replace it with the power of military garrisons, behind the backs of the people.

I was not telling in vain that

those responsible for the coup did everything possible to prevent the Algerian Army from becoming a people's army, to prevent the armed forces, the working class and the peasantry from becoming closely associated, as has happened in our country. Because in order to foment a militarist spirit the armed forces cannot be truly popular and revolutionary and have roots in the people and their revolutionary and progressive classes. By repressing the students, the youth, the workers, I don't see how anyone, however well intentioned, however imbued with revolutionary ideas and aims, can get anywhere.

And as we see the news, and the cables about the repression that is taking place, we believe that the facts will show more and more each day how unjustifiable the procedure was and what painful consequences it may bring to Algeria. But there is something more. The Algerian Army was formed, to a considerable extent, of revolutionary fighters.

Revolutionary Army

It is very difficult, in so few years and in the middle of a revolutionary process, for any clique to have been able to inculcate a caste spirit, to wipe out the patriotic and revolutionary feelings of the men, of the fighters who make up the Army. Armies of this kind are no good for repression, armies of this kind cannot be led against the people for long.

To count on the unconditional support of armies of a revolutionary origin, in the middle of a revolutionary process, against the revolutionary people, is mad, mad and suicidal.

And for that reason we see the picture of Algeria today with sorrow. From the bottom of our hearts we hope that brother country can escape the enormous abyss which has been opened before it, that it can overcome its difficulties without bloodshed. For this, it would be necessary for those who undertook the adventure, to understand in time the extent of their actions and the consequences they could bring for their country. Almost a miracle would be necessary. In their situation they would have to march forward firmly and decisively, showing in deeds the intentions they claim to have, in which case, if they were audacious, if they had the capacity, if they understood that such a battle cannot be won without the support of the people, they would

have a difficult but not impossible road ahead, with great but not unsurmountable obstacles.

The road of counterrevolution cannot be taken in Algeria. Military despotism, political reaction and repression cannot prevail in a country whose people won independence and freedom only a few years ago at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives; a people who learned how to handle their weapons and to fight against a larger and better equipped army than that of Boumedienne. Repression, political reaction and counterrevolution have no possible place in Algeria.

Our attitude will be determined by facts and based on principles. Our hope is that they may be capable of understanding the blunder they have committed. And if they are not capable of this, our hope is that they have the courage to show in deeds that they are more revolutionary than the man they have overthrown, that they can justify in deeds what is completely unjustifiable as far as the method used is concerned. And our position will be determined by what they do, regardless of what they are doing now. If they should break relations with us, they should not be the first military regime to do so. We are not thinking of today, we are thinking of the future, and we do not act as opportunists but as Marxist-Leninists.

If those who staged the coup show by their deeds that they are against imperialism, if they show in deeds that they are wholeheartedly with the Algerian Revolution, that they are body and soul with the revolution of the oppressed peoples of Africa and of the whole world, we would not deny them our support, we will not deny them our backing.

And if because they are revolutionaries the imperialists one day turned against them and threatened Algeria, we would not deny Algeria our moral support, and we would not deny our blood to help them, to help the Algerian Revolution, to help the Algerian people.

But what side are we on, and what side will we be on? We are and we will be with the Algerian people and with those who interpret their revolutionary will. And the Algerian people will be with the revolutionaries. And our support will be, therefore, for the Revolution. And it is the people who will decide tomorrow just as they are deciding today.

Letters From Our Readers

[This column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Writers' initials will be used, names being withheld unless authorization is given for use.]

We Second the Motion

Brooklyn, N.Y.
Whereas the sentiment of the majority of the people of the United States of America is against the war in Vietnam, and whereas the armed forces sta-

tioned in this beleaguered area are dying needlessly, I therefore propose the formation of a committee for a Referendum on the War in Vietnam.

C.R.

Seeks Real Satisfaction

Berkeley, Calif.
I voted for DeBerry-Shaw in '64. I tried to convince my friends that there was no material difference between Goldwater and Johnson. They didn't believe me. Now I have the "satisfaction" of saying, "I told you so." But this is really little satisfaction. I would really be much more satisfied if we had a democratic government which represented the interests of the American people and not merely a few die-hard capitalists.

Please renew my subscription. Check is enclosed.

R.C.C.

Doesn't Like Us

Whitefish Bay, Wisc.
After reading your paper for many weeks, I finally have no choice but to cancel my subscription. Please hear me out.

I was searching for a paper that spoke the truth but, instead, found only another propaganda sheet which reads like a leftist *Reader's Digest*. Certainly I am in support of the civil rights movement, certainly we should leave Vietnam, certainly we should never have entered the Dominican Republic, certainly Johnson is an ass, but the way in which you attempt to declare these views should make any intelligent reader cringe in the corner and scream. Some of your articles are not bad, but I am tired of having to rake through the ludicrous and trite propaganda to find the bits of truth and intelligence.

I am by no means a flag-waving, God-is-on-our-side type ultratriot, but I do have a certain amount of confidence in and hope for the potential of this country (though certainly not by way of the great society), and I do not wish to associate myself with the kind of despotism and ignorance you seem to champion.

K.P.

Johnson's Doubletalk

Cambridge, Mass.
Enclosed is \$10 for a subscription renewal and contribution. You may take this as a vote of confidence in much of your coverage and discussion of the Vietnam and Dominican conflicts.

I hope you will give considerable space to analysis of Johnson's "address" to the UN representatives in San Francisco. There seems to be no end to the President's doubletalk. The man who has escalated the war in Vietnam to tragic heights in the worst possible ways and who dispatched 20,000 troops to the Dominican Republic (not to mention the participation in the Congo hostilities and the threats to bomb China's military plants) had the effrontery to say: "... in the last two decades man has moved steadily away from war as either an instrument of national policy or a means of international decision ... By providing a forum for the opinions of the world, the United Nations has given them a force and an influence that they have never had before. By shining the light of inquiry and discussion upon very dark and isolated conflicts, it has pressed the nations of the world to conform their courses to the requirements of the UN Charter."

Keep up the good work.

S.H.K.

Thought for the Week

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam." — Lyndon B. Johnson, August 12, 1964.

Nonviolence in Vietnam?

Brooklyn, N.Y.

I have been reading in the press of the debate in the civil rights movement on whether they will or will not support Johnson's war against Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and wherever else he strikes next.

In all honesty, the least the "respected" civil rights leaders could do is demand that their method of nonviolence be used by the U.S. army in all these places.

Now, J. Edgar Hoover has surely taken to using nonviolence against the Klan and the White Citizens Councils in the South. Remember the FBI agent who rode with the murderers of Mrs. Liuzzo?

Wilkins, Farmer and Rustin, the "nonviolent three," should demand that Johnson, their president, start using nonviolence in Vietnam. If it's good enough for the colored folk, it's good enough for Johnson.

Malcolm X was honest about this. He said that whenever the white power structure started using nonviolent methods against the black people in this country, he would recommend that the black people start using it too. But as long as the man was going to get nasty, why the black

man could use nasty methods in self-defense.

If the "nonviolent three" want to be respected by Johnson, that's one thing; but if they want to become leaders of the most oppressed people in this country, then they had better acquire some of Malcolm's honesty and decide that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." If they can't find out who the black man's real enemy is in this country, let them take a ride uptown and ask around. They'll get some answers, and it won't be respectable either.

The Vietnam people have had a long, hot summer. It's about time that Johnson and his army got their feet off their necks.

Sylvia Weinstein

Welcome Back to the Fight

Napa, Calif.

I was given a copy of *The Militant* at the Berkeley teach-in, May 21-22, and am favorably impressed. The article by Robert Vernon (May 24 issue) re Malcolm X and the reference to the April *Monthly Review*, also on Malcolm X, were particularly revealing to me.

Since World War II, I have drifted through, somehow, a sort of political coma. Believe me, it is wonderful to behold our kids beginning to take over and ac-

tually breaking through the paper and sound barriers. This, plus the insight provided by the May 24 *Militant* on the Negro struggle, plus the reaction I experienced on attempting to share these views with some of my liberal (?) friends, constituted a rude but much-needed awakening for me.

I am on my third time around the 21 dateline and the feeling I now have is, well, like — where have I been the last 20 years?

Currently, in the California newspapers, the politicians are zeroing in on the administration of the University of California and that will be interesting to watch. At long last I believe we have, in our kids, the awareness, dedication and, best of all, the guts to confront The Beast which is wreaking havoc and shedding the blood of people around the world.

Please enter my name on a one-year sub.

A.J.A.

Trading Stamps Can Help

Los Angeles, Calif.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is trying to get enough trading stamps to purchase buses to transport Southern voters to the polls. Interested persons may send 10 or more trading stamps of any kind to: SNCC, Box 210, Mill Valley, Calif.

E.B.

It Was Reported in the Press

In Two Sizes, Yet — For swimming pool owners who can't stop bending the elbow long enough to take a swim, we are pleased to report that Hammacher Schlemmer in New York is offering "floating glasses" — no danger of shattering glass; made of durable plastic. Highballs or Old Fashioneds. In red, white, blue, moss green, or amber. Only \$5.95 for a set of eight.

Brain-Washers at Work — In a recent column, Walter Lippmann recalled a personal experience that provides an insight into just one of the countless methods used by government propagandists. He wrote: "Back in the Forties when the cold war had begun ... I was invited to lunch in the Pentagon with a high official. The object of the lunch was to persuade me to write articles in favor of launching a preventive nuclear war against the Soviet Union." Lippmann declined. Others obviously didn't.

Lucky Fidel — A town in Missouri has a sign on the main highway announcing that its name is Cuba. The sign adds: "No Castro."

Free-World Statistic — Nguyen Cao Ky, South Vietnamese dictator-of-the-moment, gave an indication of what GI's are fighting to preserve in that country when he declared: "Eighty percent (of the South Vietnamese people) live in misery and this includes the soldiers of the Vietnamese Army, the lowest paid anywhere in the world, whose wives become beggars and prostitutes in order to survive."

You Can Say That Again — After Johnson breakfasted with Harry Truman in the presidential suite at the Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City last month, the latter complimented the former in these words: "In my historic memory," said Mr. Truman, "no president

has made a greater impact during his first months in office." Especially on the women and children of the peasant villages of Vietnam!

Cops Will Be Cops — Fifty pickpockets in Khulna, India, petitioned the deputy commissioner of police, saying, "Most of us would like to leave the trade." They complained that dishonest policemen insisted they stay in the trade so the police could get their share of the loot.

The Bright Side — Restrictions in New York on the use of water have cut down on the sale of garden hoses and related supplies. But not all merchants are discouraged. One confided to the *Wall Street Journal*: "If the drought continues, there will be a lot of burned-out lawns by fall and our sale of grass seed should more than make up for the hose and sprinkler sales we're losing now."

We Wonder Why — It was not reported in the press, but a Puckish correspondent writes that the following joke is currently making the rounds in Mexico:

"Did you know that 'Texas' is now 'Tex'?"

"No. Why?"

"Because they moved the 'as' to Washington."

Tough-Situation Dep't — An article in the financial section of the *New York Times* reports that, contrary to popular notion, the life

of an American business executive abroad is no bed of roses. Such American staples as roast beef, steak or lobster are often expensive and, even worse, American name-brand toilet articles are hard to come by. The wife of an American executive stationed in West Berlin said she had sent back home for soap, toothpaste and other name-brand toilet articles that she was used to and that it had cost her \$50. She commented: "We obviously can't keep this up. I am either going to have to get used to German soap or stop taking baths."

Sales and Sociology — Troubled because the sale of formal wedding gowns isn't keeping up with the marriage rate, the wedding-gown industry is mapping a research project which will prove that "quickie" marriages are increasing the divorce rate. The results of the research will be brought to the attention of the nation's clergymen and sociologists. Reporting on this, the discerning *New York Times* explained: "The objective, of course, is to increase the number of formal weddings and hence the sale of wedding gowns."

Double Whammy — The practice of showing movies on air flights has been taken hold of by the Philippine Air Lines which will show double features.

—Harry Ring

INTRODUCTORY SUBSCRIPTION

To reach the widest audience with our coverage of the antiwar and Freedom Now movements, we are offering a 4-month introductory subscription to *The Militant* for \$1. (\$1.50 outside of the U.S.)

Name

Street Zone

City State

Send to *The Militant*, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. 10003.



Socialists in Detroit Endorse Cleage for Common Council

DETROIT — Robert Himmel, the first candidate to file in this year's mayoralty election, has declared his support to the campaign of Rev. Albert B. Cleage who is running for the common council. Himmel, who is Wayne County Chairman of the Socialist Workers Party, made this announcement on July 2, following a decision by the SWP's Wayne County Committee to endorse Rev. Cleage.

"The question of Negro representation on the common council," said Himmel, "is of vital concern, not only to the Negro people but to democratic-minded whites as well."

"Negroes constitute about one-third of the population of Detroit. They are victims of police brutality and every other possible form of racial discrimination. We believe that the argument about Negroes being best represented by Negroes is irrefutable. In all fairness, at least three Negroes should be elected to the common council this year."

Independence

"We have decided to give our support to Rev. Cleage because he has demonstrated an uncompromising militancy and has maintained complete independence from the political machines of the Detroit power structure."

"Despite any disagreements we might have with him on one or another specific question, we believe Rev. Cleage expresses the deepest sentiments of the Negro masses. We call for a united effort



Rev. Albert B. Cleage

by all honest militants, black and white, to elect Rev. Albert B. Cleage to the common council."

Himmel, whose candidacy for mayor is supported by the Socialist Workers Party, is 37 years old and works as a printer. He is running against liberal Democrat Cavanagh, the incumbent mayor, on a program which calls for an end to the war in Vietnam, equal and adequate education for all children, an end to police brutality, and for a 30 hour workweek at 40 hours pay and other measures to eliminate unemployment and poverty.

SWP ENDORSES INDEPENDENT

Negro Runs for Mayor of Cleveland

By Eric Reinthaler

CLEVELAND — On June 21, state Representative Carl B. Stokes filed petitions bearing 32,000 signatures, double the legal requirement, in his bid as an independent Negro candidate for mayor of Cleveland. On July 3, the Cleveland board of elections declared that Stokes had won a place on the ballot.

The Cleveland branch of the Socialist Workers Party has announced that it is supporting Stokes as an independent black candidate, although from a critical point of view.

Stokes said, "I'm sure the professionals never believed we'd get this amount of signatures. It goes to illustrate a deep sense of discontent in the Negro community."

Stokes announced his plans to run for mayor after Cleveland voters overwhelmingly rejected the "payroll tax" advocated by present Democratic Mayor Ralph Locher, and after former school board chairman Ralph McAllister said he was running for mayor as an independent. McAllister has received the support of the Collinwood Improvement Association, and elements associated with the National Association for the Advancement of White People and other racist groups.

Political Force

Militant local civil rights activists and nationalists are generally in support of the Stokes campaign but from a critical point of view. They say that the campaign is an important step forward in building an independent black political force in the ghetto in opposition to the Republican and Democratic parties. At the same time, these militants see weaknesses in Stokes' campaign, namely, absence of a statement of program, failure to take a stand on the case of fired Negro schoolteacher Don Freeman, and failure to indicate what he is against — especially with respect to the

record and public positions of McAllister and Locher.

The Freedom Fighters and some CORE activists are asking Stokes to take a forthright position for a civilian police review board and against Police Chief Wagner's slander of black nationalism. The militants also point out that while Stokes sat on the platform at a recent meeting critical of the war in Vietnam, Stokes himself has made no public statement in opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

One nationalist said, "It is theoretically possible for Stokes to win, but that can only be accomplished by the people in the ghetto seeing an entirely different kind of program than Stokes has so far put forward. Some of the middle-class Negroes around Stokes are conservatizing forces that can alienate the ghetto Negro."

"These middle-class Negro 'conservatives' say they don't want to alienate the white liberal vote. Let's face it, the white liberals are almost nonexistent in Cleveland, they all live in the suburbs. So who are you going to alienate? With that kind of thinking you can alienate the people you need most: militants and radicals who, if they have a strong program to work with, can really help mobilize the ghetto. That's where the people are and that's where the votes are."

Professional machine politicians were "surprised" at the tremendous petition campaign carried on by Stokes and his supporters, who were largely grass-roots workers in the ghetto. Though Stokes is a second-term Democratic state representative, he has repeatedly emphasized that he is conducting an independent campaign. Not one of Cleveland's 10 Negro councilmen (nine of whom are Democrats) supported his petition campaign.

During the three-week period of intense activity in which the bulk of Stokes' petition signatures

N. Y. Socialist Candidate Scores Shooting of Negro by Policeman

NEW YORK, July 19 — Paul Boutelle, Socialist Workers Party candidate for President of the Borough of Manhattan, issued a statement today pointing out that the latest police killing underscores the need for a civilian police review board in New York City. Boutelle referred to the fatal shooting of Nelson Erby, a 28-year-old Negro, on July 15 at a street corner in Brooklyn, by patrolman Sheldon Liebowitz.

At least two contradictory accounts of the shooting have been published: According to the police report, Erby, who was performing some "strange" actions, attacked the policeman with a knife when Liebowitz tried to quiet him. Liebowitz disarmed Erby, who then grabbed Liebowitz's gun and shot him in the arm. The police claim a white truck driver came to the policeman's aid and knocked the gun from Erby's hand. Liebowitz picked up the gun and shot Erby several times, killing him.

Representatives of CORE who questioned eye-witnesses to the shooting gave a very different account of what happened: Liebowitz went up to Erby, who was standing on the corner praying out loud, and tried to handcuff him. When Erby resisted being handcuffed, Liebowitz drew his gun and accidentally wounded himself in the arm. Two white men went to Liebowitz's aid; one of them began whipping Erby. Liebowitz, who had dropped his gun, re-



"A civilian review board would impair my efficiency."

trieved it and emptied the pistol into the Negro. Witnesses did not see the knife that police claimed Erby wielded.

"This is a case of the worst kind of brutality," said Boutelle. "Even if the police report were true, that's no reason for killing a man. Cops keep murdering black people because they know they can get away with it. Every murder that police officials whitewash or cover up encourages further police brutality."

"No board of police officials could be trusted to review this case honestly, and give fair consideration to CORE's story as well as the police's. Police officials have consistently condoned the murder of black people by the cops. It's their honesty that is in question — as much as the racist brutality of the cops on the beat."

The candidate for Manhattan Borough President spoke at the public hearings of the City Council on proposed legislation for a civilian review board on July 14. He opened his remarks by reading a statement in behalf of all the Socialist Workers Party candidates in the coming fall elections. It said in part:

"The Socialist Workers Party calls for a civilian review board made up of direct representatives of the neighborhoods involved, to deal with all complaints of police brutality. We also favor the passage of the present bill introduced into the City Council by Theodore S. Weiss for a civilian complaint review board, even though it falls short of what minority peoples need in protection and means of redress from the violence of racist cops."

N. J. Gubernatorial Nominee Blasts U.S. Policy in Dominican Republic

NEWARK, July 21 — Ruth Shiminsky, Socialist Workers Party candidate for governor of New Jersey, demanded the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from the Dominican Republic, in a statement today. The candidate said:

"The U.S. government has tried to cover up its aggression in the Dominican Republic with the fig leaf of the OAS. Continued demonstrations by the people of Santo Domingo demanding the withdrawal of American troops show that this invading army is there not only illegally, but against the will of the Dominican people."

"The U.S. has withdrawn some of its troops — especially the Marines, whose very name connotes intervention in Latin America — to improve its image. But it did so only after reorganizing and strengthening the reactionary military forces that have suppressed the Dominican people through terror, and against which they rose up in order to re-establish a constitutional government."

"Most U.S. forces still remain on the island and there is no chance that they will leave while the Dominican people remain armed and organized to fight the dictatorship that has oppressed them."

"Johnson's arrogant intervention to prevent the overthrow of an illegal dictatorship and the re-institution of the elected, constitutional government, has opened the eyes of many Americans to the real role that this government plays in the world. It is becoming clearer that the government's claim

to be fighting for democracy and freedom is a lie."

"One of many means — but an important one — to protest and fight against U.S. aggression is to vote against the political parties that carry out and support this aggression. The Socialist Workers Party campaign gives people in New Jersey an opportunity to do so. We call for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from the Dominican Republic and Vietnam immediately. We urge those who agree with this demand to vote for us and support our campaign in every way they can."



Ruth Shiminsky